

Higher Ed Benchmarks

Noel-Levitz Report on Undergraduate Enrollment Trends

2010 Deposits/Confirmed Students as of May 1 at Four-Year Institutions

This report provides an early indication of fall 2010 enrollments in higher education by documenting changes in the numbers of deposited/confirmed students at four-year colleges and universities as of May 1, 2010, versus May 1, 2009, along with changes in admitted students, applicants, and projected summer melt.

The report is based on a Web-based poll Noel-Levitz conducted of college and university admissions offices at accredited, four-year postsecondary institutions. The poll was conducted between May 4 and May 17, 2010, as part of Noel-Levitz's ongoing series of benchmark polls.

Highlights from the findings:

- May 1 deposits/confirmations from first-year, first-time-in-college students increased for two-thirds of institutions, but the remaining third that saw declines included nearly half of small public institutions and half of Midwest institutions.
- Two-thirds of respondents expected higher-than-usual summer melt, led by nearly three-quarters of respondents from small public institutions.
- Yield rates (from admitted to deposited/confirmed) rose for only about half of institutions. In addition, yield rates for public institutions were consistently higher than they were for private institutions, though more private institutions than public institutions reported increases.
- The majority of large institutions met their May 1 goal for deposits/confirmations, but the majority of small institutions fell short.
- Most institutions admitted more students and received more applications in 2010 than in 2009.
- Deposits/confirmations came in slower than they normally do for over half of public institutions.


For a glimpse into how campuses are shifting their strategies, don't miss the summary of respondents' comments on pages 7-9.

Watch for final headcount benchmarks and retention indicators

Noel-Levitz plans to continue following the progress of the entering class of 2010 by benchmarking final enrollment and retention in October. In addition, the firm plans to conduct a poll near the end of the first term to identify trends in mid-year indicators of student persistence and retention.



Noel-Levitz®



For a glimpse into how campuses are shifting their strategies, see pages 7-9.

Contents

See how your institution stacks up on...

Deposits/confirmations as of May 1, 2010	3
Admits as of May 1, 2010	4
Applications as of May 1, 2010	5
Yield rates from admit to deposit/confirmed	5
Rate of receiving deposits/confirmations	6
Expected summer melt	7
Qualitative reports from respondents on how the economy is changing their strategies	7

The source of data

This benchmark report for higher education is based on a national poll conducted by Noel-Levitz via e-mail between May 4 and May 17, 2010. The poll asked undergraduate enrollment and admission officers from four-year public and private institutions to report their numbers of deposited/confirmed students, admitted students, and applications received from first-time-in-college, first-year undergraduates by May 1, 2010, versus May 1, 2009. Percentage changes were then calculated to identify the one-year increases or decreases in applications, admits, and deposited/confirmed students for each sector.

In addition, respondents reported their May 1, 2010, goal for first-year, first-time-in-college students, the rate at which they received deposits/confirmations, and their expected summer melt.

For a list of participating institutions and a list of the states and provinces represented, please see pages 10 and 11.



View more reports online

To access the entire series of benchmark reports from Noel-Levitz, including our 2010 E-Recruiting Practices and Trends Report and 2010 Applications Report, visit www.noellevitz.com/Benchmarks.

Majority of four-year institutions report gains in FTIC deposits/confirmations as of May 1—but exceptions were notable

For more than half of respondents, May 1 deposits/confirmations received from first-year, first-time-in-college (FTIC) undergraduates for fall 2010 increased compared to a year earlier. This positive trend held true for both the public sector and the private sector, regardless of enrollment size, with the greatest increases occurring at private institutions.

While the positive trend was noteworthy, so was the variability in the reports from campuses. Although a quarter of institutions saw significant gains, many institutions saw declines as well (see additional detail in Table 2 below). The variability in responses was especially noticeable among small institutions.

Table 1: Change in number of May 1 FTIC deposits/confirmations received: 2010 versus 2009

	4-Year Public	Small 4-Year Public	Large 4-Year Public	4-Year Private	Small 4-Year Private	Large 4-Year Private
25th percentile	-4.2%	-6.2%	-3.2%	-3.7%	-6.5%	-0.6%
Median change	3.3%	1.7%	3.8%	6.4%	4.9%	6.8%
75th percentile	12.6%	14.1%	11.0%	18.7%	19.8%	17.8%

As of May 1, 2010, most four-year institutions had received deposits/confirmations at or above their 2009 levels—but exceptions were noteworthy.

Note: To determine differences by enrollment size, institutions with total enrollments equal to or less than the median enrollment size of the sample were classified as “small” while institutions with enrollment sizes above the median were classified as “large.” This median fell at 9,221 students for public institutions and at 2,048 students for private institutions.

One-third of institutions report declines, including nearly half of small public institutions and half of Midwest institutions

A separate analysis using a different metric—simply, the percentage of institutions that reported decreases in deposits/confirmations in 2010 versus 2009, regardless of the amount of the decrease—showed that 38 percent of public institutions and 34 percent of private institutions reported declines in May 1 deposits/confirmations. In addition, 47 percent of small public institutions and 38 percent of small private institutions reported declines.

Regional differences were significant. Among the most noteworthy differences by region: Fully half of four-year institutions in the Midwest reported declines. In addition, 60 percent of small public and private institutions in the Midwest reported declines, as did 60 percent of small public institutions in the South.

Table 2: A closer look: Percentage of institutions that reported a decrease in May 1 FTIC deposits/confirmations by region (2010 vs. 2009)

	4-Year Public	Small 4-Year Public	Large 4-Year Public	4-Year Private	Small 4-Year Private	Large 4-Year Private
East	42.3%	50.0%	25.0%*	24.7%	26.3%	23.4%
Midwest	50.0%	60.0%*	44.4%*	51.7%	61.3%	40.7%
South	21.4%	60.0%*	0.0%*	37.5%	34.3%	42.9%
West	35.7%	16.7%*	50.0%*	23.1%	28.6%	19.4%
Total	38.2%	47.1%	29.4%	33.5%	37.6%	29.4%

Even though most institutions were ahead in deposits/confirmations, a closer look shows that fully one-third saw declines, with significant differences by institution size and region. For a list of the states included in each region, please see page 11.

* Please use caution in interpreting this percentage due to the smaller sample for this region-size breakdown.

Two-thirds of respondents reported increases and one-third reported declines, as shown in Table 2. Smaller institutions and institutions in the Midwest were more likely to report declines.

Majority of large institutions met May 1 goals while most small institutions fell short, though exceptions were again noteworthy on both counts

A comparison of May 1 goals to May 1 deposits showed the deposit increases reported on page 3 were more satisfying for large institutions than for small institutions, as the latter tended to set higher goals that proved difficult to reach. This was especially the case at small private institutions, the segment that most often fell short of goal.

Exceptions were once again significant, as more than one quarter of large institutions fell short of goal while at least one-quarter of small institutions exceeded their goal.

A separate analysis by region showed no significant differences in this area among the four geographic regions examined.

Table 3: Variance between FTIC goals for May 1, 2010, and actual May 1 FTIC deposits/confirmations

	4-Year Public	Small 4-Year Public	Large 4-Year Public	4-Year Private	Small 4-Year Private	Large 4-Year Private
25th percentile	-8.8%	-10.0%	-3.5%	-12.8%	-18.0%	-8.0%
Median variance	-0.9%	-4.1%	0.8%	-2.5%	-6.5%	0.7%
75th percentile	4.9%	7.8%	3.9%	5.1%	3.0%	6.8%

A comparison of goals to outcomes shows the majority of large institutions met their goals for deposits/confirmations while the majority of small institutions fell short of their goals, with the greatest shortages occurring at small private institutions.

Number of admitted students rises for nearly three-quarters of institutions

Nearly three-quarters of institutions reported admitting more students in 2010 than in 2009. Small institutions led the way in this area, up 6 and 7 percent at the median, respectively, for the public and private sectors.

The range of responses was again significant, as one-quarter of institutions admitted at least 13 to 17 percent more students while another quarter admitted about the same number of students or fewer compared to the number they admitted in 2009.

A separate analysis by region showed no significant differences in admissions among the four geographic regions examined.

Table 4: Change in size of May 1 FTIC admitted pools, 2010 versus 2009

	4-Year Public	Small 4-Year Public	Large 4-Year Public	4-Year Private	Small 4-Year Private	Large 4-Year Private
25th percentile	0.4%	-0.4%	0.5%	0.6%	-0.3%	1.3%
Median change	4.1%	6.2%	2.6%	6.8%	6.9%	6.4%
75th percentile	12.7%	16.2%	9.5%	16.8%	17.1%	16.1%

Admission rates rose in 2010, regardless of enrollment size, region, or institution type.

In a separate 2010 Noel-Levitz study of enrollment trends at private colleges, a key finding was that students with greater need enrolled at private colleges in greater numbers in fall 2009 while students with greater capacity to pay enrolled at private colleges in smaller numbers. See page 4 of our 2010 Discounting Report at www.noellevitz.com/Benchmarks.

Number of applications rises for majority of institutions

For more than half of respondents, the number of applications received by May 1, 2010, exceeded the number received by May 1, 2009, by at least five percent. Large private institutions led the way in this area, up 10 percent at the median.

In the public sector, small institutions reported receiving more applications than large institutions. In addition, for the public sector overall, one-quarter of institutions reported increases of at least 11 to 14 percent while another quarter reported declines of 1 percent or more.

In the private sector, one-quarter of institutions reported increases of 19 percent or more while another quarter reported a change of just plus or minus 2 percent or less.

Table 5: Change in number of FTIC applications received by May 1, 2010, versus May 1, 2009

	4-Year Public	Small 4-Year Public	Large 4-Year Public	4-Year Private	Small 4-Year Private	Large 4-Year Private
25th percentile	-1.0%	-1.0%	-1.2%	0.2%	-1.9%	1.9%
Median change	5.0%	8.4%	4.6%	8.8%	8.2%	9.5%
75th percentile	11.3%	14.4%	7.8%	19.3%	19.4%	18.7%

Consistent with an earlier study* conducted in March 2010, most institutions had received applications at or above their 2009 levels by May 1. A separate analysis showed that this trend held true across geographic regions.

* See 2010 Application Counts at Four-Year and Two-Year Institutions, available at www.noellevitz.com/Benchmarks.

Yield rates ranged from 23 to 37 percent at the median; consistently higher at public institutions than at private institutions

As shown in Table 6 below (the first of two tables on Yield), median admit-to-confirmed yield rates ranged up to 37 percent for respondents in this 2010 study.

Consistent with the earlier tables and findings, a wide variance in reported outcomes continued, as one-quarter of institutions reported yield rates between 19 and 27 percent or less while another quarter reported yield rates between 30 and 44 percent or more.

Compared to their private institution counterparts, respondents from public institutions reported admit-to-confirmed yield rates ranging from 8 to 14 percentage points higher at the median.

Among small private institutions, yield rates ranged from .3 to 2.6 percentage points higher in the three quartiles shown in the table below compared to the rates reported by large private institutions. Please see Table 7 for more details.

Table 6: 2010 yield rate from FTIC admitted pool as of May 1, 2010

	4-Year Public	Small 4-Year Public	Large 4-Year Public	4-Year Private	Small 4-Year Private	Large 4-Year Private
25th percentile	26.8%	26.8%	25.5%	19.0%	19.2%	18.9%
Median yield	35.3%	33.2%	37.1%	24.4%	25.5%	22.9%
75th percentile	42.2%	43.7%	41.0%	31.4%	32.5%	30.3%

Public institutions' reported yield rates (admit-to-confirmed) were consistently higher than those of private institutions.

In a separate study of trends at public and private institutions, a key finding was that, instead of inquiring, one-quarter to one-third of prospective students now wait until they send in an application to make themselves known to their chosen institution(s). See page 3 of our 2010 E-Recruiting Practices and Trends Report at www.noellevitz.com/Benchmarks.

Yield rates rose for only about half of institutions; more private institutions than public institutions reported increases

A separate analysis using a different metric—simply, the percentage of institutions that reported a higher admit-to-confirmed yield rate in 2010 than in 2009, regardless of the amount of the increase—showed that only 43 percent of public institutions and 51 percent of private institutions reported an increase in admit-to-confirmed yield as of May 1, 2010.

Differences by region and institution size were significant. Overall, more large institutions than small institutions reported higher yield rates; yet the largest reported yield overall was for small public institutions in the West. Also noteworthy: In the East and West, many more large private institutions than large public institutions reported an increased yield rate. In addition, compared to the rest of the nation, fewer institutions in the Midwest and South reported an increase in yield.

Table 7: Percentage of institutions that reported a higher FTIC admit-to-confirmed yield rate in 2010 vs. 2009 by region

	4-Year Public	Small 4-Year Public	Large 4-Year Public	4-Year Private	Small 4-Year Private	Large 4-Year Private
East	46.2%	50.0%	37.5%*	59.5%	54.1%	63.8%
Midwest	35.7%	20.0%*	44.4%*	36.8%	40.0%	33.3%
South	38.5%	0.0%*	62.5%*	46.4%	45.7%	47.6%
West	50.0%	66.7%*	37.5%*	58.8%	65.0%	54.8%
Total	43.3%	41.2%	45.5%	51.2%	50.0%	52.4%

Admit-to-confirmed yield rates rose for approximately half of the institutions in this study, led by small public institutions in the West.

* Please use caution in interpreting this percentage due to the smaller sample for this region-size breakdown.

Deposits/confirmations came in slower than they normally do for over half of public institutions

As shown below, 52 percent of four-year public institutions and 39 percent of four-year private institutions reported that their deposits/confirmations came in slower in 2010 than in previous years. In addition, overall, more small institutions than large institutions reported receiving confirmations at a slower rate.

A separate analysis by region showed that respondents from institutions in the West reported receiving deposits/confirmations at a significantly faster rate than respondents from institutions elsewhere.

Table 8: Rate of receiving deposits/confirmations in 2010 compared to previous years

	4-Year Public	Small 4-Year Public	Large 4-Year Public	4-Year Private	Small 4-Year Private	Large 4-Year Private
Faster than normal	27.5%	23.5%	31.4%	33.7%	31.5%	36.0%
About the same as previous years	20.3%	17.6%	22.9%	27.8%	25.2%	30.4%
Slower than normal	52.2%	58.8%	45.7%	38.5%	43.3%	33.6%

Many respondents reported receiving deposits/confirmations at a slower rate in 2010 than in previous years, led by respondents from small public institutions.

Although yield rates from admit to confirmed were consistently higher for public institutions, more private institutions reported increases, especially private institutions in the East and West.

Why the delays? A number of respondents commented that the delays were due to families who were waiting to have all costs and offers in hand before responding. See additional respondent comments on pages 7-9.

Two-thirds of respondents anticipating higher-than-usual summer melt

The majority of respondents from across institution types—large and small, public and private—reported that they expected cancellations and no-shows to be “higher than normal” in the summer of 2010. Small four-year public institutions led the way in this area, with nearly three-quarters of respondents from that segment reporting an expected increase in summer melt.

On the flip side, a sizable minority of respondents ranging from 11 percent to 33 percent reported that they expected summer melt to be lower than normal, led by respondents from large four-year public institutions.

A separate analysis by region showed that respondents from four-year institutions in the West, public and private, were more likely than respondents from institutions elsewhere to report that summer melt would be “about the same” as previous years.

Table 9: Expected rate of summer melt

	4-Year Public	Small 4-Year Public	Large 4-Year Public	4-Year Private	Small 4-Year Private	Large 4-Year Private
Higher than normal	66.2%	74.3%	58.3%	65.1%	64.0%	66.1%
About the same as previous years	11.3%	14.3%	8.3%	18.3%	21.6%	15.0%
Lower than normal	22.5%	11.4%	33.3%	16.7%	14.4%	18.9%

Two-thirds of respondents expected more cancellations and no-shows in the summer of 2010 than in previous summers, led by respondents from small public institutions.

What can you do to reduce summer melt? See a variety of strategies reported by respondents in the “comments” sections of the poll on page 9.

Qualitative findings

How is the economy changing things?

No additional quantitative data were collected for this 2010 study beyond the data that appear on pages 3-6 and in the table above. However, many respondents offered qualitative comments on the economy’s impact on their yield strategies, students’ behavior, and strategies to avoid summer melt. These comments are summarized below.

Changes in yield strategies

The most frequently mentioned effect of the economy on yield strategies for respondents across institution types was an **increase in the volume of contacts aimed at addressing students’ concerns about costs and finances**. Additional effects included the following.

Four-year public institutions

In addition to the increased contact volume, other frequently-mentioned changes cited by respondents from four-year public institutions included:

- increased the amount of scholarship aid
- awarded aid to more students than in the past
- added yield events
- communicated earlier about financial aid

- called targeted populations such as admits, financial aid awardees who had not confirmed, and scholarship students
- emphasized the value of a university education and/or graduate outcomes
- admitted more students (but for different reasons such as higher enrollment goals, anticipating higher melt, or due to delays in deposits)

Four-year private institutions

In addition to the increased contact volume cited, other frequently-mentioned changes listed by respondents from four-year private institutions included:

- more aggressive approach in general
- adjusted financial aid awarding strategies to address students’ concerns about costs

- increased use of financial aid to recruit (see *financial aid awarding changes* below)
- focused on being *earlier* in a wide range of areas (see *earlier efforts* section below)
- increased telephone and e-mail contacts
- spread yield strategies throughout the admissions cycle
- more messages that emphasized value and affordability (see *messaging changes* at right)
- more personalized, customized, and targeted communications
- more yield events such as adding an on-campus “Admitted Student Day” and hosting additional receptions
- more contacts by non-admissions staff members, including faculty, alumni, current parents, and the president
- increased travel
- admitted more students
- subsidized travel expenses for student visits
- increased use of social media

Financial aid awarding changes

Among the most-frequently-cited financial aid strategy changes at four-year private institutions were the following:

- awarded more merit aid
- awarded more need-based aid
- increased the discount rate
- focused more on net revenue than on headcount

Earlier efforts in a wide range of areas

In general, being earlier was a significant focus for respondents from four-year private institutions. Among the earlier efforts mentioned were:

- initiated yield strategies earlier
- earlier push for deposits and confirmations
- announced admissions decisions earlier
- earlier announcements of scholarship and/or grant awards
- extended incentive periods for deposits
- earlier distribution of class schedules—sent out at pre-orientation versus mailed in summer
- early estimates going out to more students
- added an “early action” option to allow more time to work through the yield process

Messaging changes

In addition to, or instead of, emphasizing value and affordability, several respondents from four-year private institutions mentioned:

- more messaging on financial aid, including education on the financial aid process
- promoting guaranteed academic merit scholarships
- promoting professional and career outcomes of graduates

Changes in observed student behavior

Four-year public institutions

The most-frequently-cited effect of the economy on students’ behavior mentioned by respondents from four-year public institutions was that students were opting for lower-cost alternatives closer to their homes. Among those who made this observation, three people specifically mentioned that commuting from home is increasing.

Many respondents noted that requests associated with costs and financial aid were higher than in previous years. Four people mentioned that more students were asking questions about the deposit requirement or seeking waivers of the deposit fee; three people mentioned they had received more FAFSA applications; and three people mentioned that scholarship competition has increased.

Several respondents also noted that students are depositing at fewer schools.

Four-year private institutions

The most-frequently-cited change in student behavior reported by respondents from four-year private institutions was a heightened sensitivity to cost. Many respondents reported that: financial need was greater; financial aid was playing a critical, in some cases primary, role in students’ decisions to attend; students were “shopping around” more than usual, creating a highly competitive environment for scholarships and financial aid; and families brought a greater reluctance to borrow.

However, a smaller yet still significant group of respondents appeared to be less concerned about costs and commented that families were less concerned about finances this year than last year.

Parents' increased willingness to appeal financial aid awards was cited by numerous respondents. "Families are approaching a college choice like they are buying a car," wrote one respondent. Another noted: "We are seeing much more desire to show awards from others' schools and have them matched." But again, these comments were offset by a smaller set of other respondents who indicated they were seeing fewer appeals and less concern about financing.

Additional frequently-mentioned changes in student behavior that were noted by respondents:

- receiving more FAFSAs
- more students applying to multiple schools
- more students choosing public schools, especially community colleges
- many more families waiting to compare financial aid awards before they deposit
- more calls to the financial aid office
- families required greater amounts of explanation and education about the financial aid process
- more requests for deposit waivers or extensions, in some cases because state schools had not yet sent out awards
- more appeals for need- and/or merit-based aid
- more visits to campus before making a decision
- greater parent involvement in the decision
- more families avoiding the payment of more than one deposit by waiting to compare financial aid awards
- more families "wooned away" by aggressive financial aid offers from less-selective institutions

Additional changes that were each mentioned by a few respondents:

- location has become more a factor in the college decision
- less interest from high-need students
- families asking more probing questions about the institution, such as its fiscal health

Were deposits "firmer" than last year? Again, respondents were divided, with some saying that family's reluctance to pay a deposit at more than one school resulted in fewer cancellations, while others reported more withdrawals, cancellations, and/or no-shows.

Changes in summer melt strategies

The change in summer melt strategy that was mentioned most frequently by respondents across institution types was a **planned increase in the volume of personal contacts and communications**. Additional effects included the following.

Four-year public institutions

In addition to the increased contact volume, many respondents mentioned increasing the number of phone calls and a few respondents mentioned increasing the volume of e-mail. A wide range of student populations were mentioned as the focus of the phone calls, including deposited/confirmed students (to head off any questions or concerns), admitted students who had not yet confirmed, registered students who had not confirmed, and students who withdraw.

Four-year private institutions

In addition to the increased contact volume noted, a number of respondents reported that they planned to maintain "constant contact" with deposited students throughout the summer. "We will be much more in touch than in the past," one respondent wrote. Another commented: "Our contact period will be prolonged." However, a smaller but still significant set of respondents commented that they will intentionally *not* work at avoiding melt in order to avoid over-shooting their enrollment goal.

A number of respondents reported that they will strive to be *earlier* (similar to the comments on page 8), pushing for earlier registrations, earlier housing confirmations, and by offering earlier connections with faculty via telephone, through online and in-person advising, and through expanded programming at orientation.

Several respondents mentioned their plans for promoting or improving orientation, including pushing harder for attendance at summer pre-orientation, planning for greater peer interaction during orientation, and adding more parent programming at orientation.

Several respondents also mentioned their plans to continue promoting the value and brand of their institution, and several respondents reported that they will offer private social networking sites for students and/or do more with social media such as Facebook and Twitter.

Responding institutions

Representatives from 330 four-year U.S. colleges and universities participated in Noel-Levitz's national electronic poll of undergraduate admissions applications, which was distributed to 2070 degree-granting, four-year institutions in May 2010. The respondents represented 74 four-year public institutions and 256 four-year private institutions. The names of the participating institutions appear below.

Four-year public institutions

Alfred State College (NY)
California Polytechnic State University-
San Luis Obispo (CA)
California State University-Monterey
Bay (CA)
California State University-
San Marcos (CA)
Clarion University of Pennsylvania (PA)
Colorado State University (CO)
Columbus State University (GA)
Edinboro University of Pennsylvania (PA)
Fashion Institute of Technology (NY)
Francis Marion University (SC)
Georgia Institute of Technology (GA)
Humboldt State University (CA)
Illinois State University (IL)
Indiana University Bloomington (IN)
Indiana University Southeast (IN)
Longwood University (VA)
Macon State College (GA)
Mesa State College (CO)
Michigan Technological University (MI)
Millersville University of
Pennsylvania (PA)
Missouri State University (MO)
New College of Florida (FL)
North Carolina Agricultural and Technical
State University (NC)
North Georgia College & State
University (GA)
Northern Kentucky University (KY)
Northern Michigan University (MI)
Ohio State University at Lima
Campus, The (OH)
Old Dominion University (VA)
Plymouth State University (NH)
Purchase College, State University of
New York (NY)
Purdue University Main Campus (IN)
Shepherd University (WV)
State University of New York at
Albany (NY)
State University of New York at
Binghamton (NY)
State University of New York at
Fredonia (NY)
State University of New York at
New Paltz (NY)
State University of New York College
at Oneonta (NY)
State University of New York College
at Potsdam (NY)
State University of New York College
of Technology at Delhi (NY)
State University of New York Maritime
College (NY)

State University of New York, The College
at Brockport (NY)
Tarleton State University (TX)
Temple University (PA)
Texas Tech University (TX)
Towson University (MD)
United States Coast Guard Academy (CT)
University of Arizona (AZ)
University of Cincinnati Main Campus (OH)
University of Georgia (GA)
University of Hawaii - West Oahu (HI)
University of Hawaii Maui College (HI)
University of Illinois at Chicago (IL)
University of Maine at Farmington (ME)
University of Massachusetts Lowell (MA)
University of Michigan-Ann Arbor (MI)
University of Michigan-Dearborn (MI)
University of Minnesota Duluth (MN)
University of Nevada, Reno (NV)
University of New Mexico Main
Campus (NM)
University of North Carolina at
Wilmington (NC)
University of North Texas (TX)
University of Northern Iowa (IA)
University of Pittsburgh at Bradford (PA)
University of South Carolina Columbia (SC)
University of South Dakota, The (SD)
University of Southern Maine (ME)
University of Southern Mississippi (MS)
University of Texas at Austin (TX)
University of Vermont (VT)
University of Wisconsin-River Falls (WI)
University of Wisconsin-Superior (WI)
University of Wyoming (WY)
West Texas A & M University (TX)
Westfield State College (MA)

Four-year private institutions

Abilene Christian University (TX)
Alfred University (NY)
Alma College (MI)
Alvernia University (PA)
Alverno College (WI)
American International College (MA)
American University (DC)
Anderson University (SC)
Anna Maria College (MA)
Aquinas College (MI)
Arcadia University (PA)
Augsburg College (MN)
Aurora University (IL)
Averett University (VA)
Azusa Pacific University (CA)
Babson College (MA)
Baker University (KS)
Baptist Bible College and Seminary (PA)
Barry University (FL)

Baylor University (TX)
Belhaven University (MS)
Bellarmine University (KY)
Belmont Abbey College (NC)
Berea College (KY)
Bethany College (KS)
Birmingham-Southern College (AL)
Bluffton University (OH)
Brescia University (KY)
Brevard College (NC)
Bryan College (TN)
Bryant University (RI)
Caldwell College (NJ)
California College of the Arts (CA)
Calvin College (MI)
Campbellsville University (KY)
Canisius College (NY)
Capital University (OH)
Carnegie Mellon University (PA)
Carroll University (WI)
Carson-Newman College (TN)
Case Western Reserve University (OH)
Catawba College (NC)
Cedarville University (OH)
Central Methodist University (MO)
Centre College (KY)
Champlain College (VT)
Chapman University (CA)
Charleston Southern University (SC)
Christendom College (VA)
Claremont McKenna College (CA)
Coe College (IA)
Colgate University (NY)
College of Idaho, The (ID)
College of New Rochelle, The (NY)
College of Notre Dame of
Maryland (MD)
Columbia College (SC)
Concordia University Chicago (IL)
Concordia University Texas (TX)
Concordia University, St. Paul (MN)
Converse College (SC)
Cornell College (IA)
Cornerstone University (MI)
Creighton University (NE)
Curry College (MA)
Dean College (MA)
Delaware Valley College (PA)
DePauw University (IN)
Dillard University (LA)
Dominican College of Blauvelt (NY)
Dominican University (IL)
Dominican University of California (CA)
Dowling College (NY)
Drew University (NJ)
Drexel University (PA)

**A special thank
you to those who
participated.**

**Sign up to receive
additional reports
and information
updates by e-mail
at
www.noellevitz.com/Subscribe.**

**Readers of this report
are invited to contact
Noel-Levitz to
schedule a
complimentary
consultation by
telephone to discuss
how to strengthen
summer melt
strategies. We'll
listen carefully to
your particular
situation and then
share insights based
on our experiences
working with
similar institutions.
To schedule an
appointment,
contact us at
1-800-876-1117
or [ContactUs@
noellevitz.com](mailto:ContactUs@noellevitz.com).**

**Please continue
next page**

Earlham College and Earlham School of Religion (IN)
 Eckerd College (FL)
 Edgewood College (WI)
 Elmhurst College (IL)
 Elmira College (NY)
 Emory & Henry College (VA)
 Evangel University (MO)
 Fisk University (TN)
 Florida Southern College (FL)
 Franciscan University of Steubenville (OH)
 Franklin W. Olin College of Engineering (MA)
 Free Will Baptist Bible College (TN)
 Gannon University (PA)
 Gardner-Webb University (NC)
 Geneva College (PA)
 George Fox University (OR)
 Georgetown College (KY)
 Gordon College (MA)
 Grace Bible College (MI)
 Grace College and Seminary (IN)
 Hamline University (MN)
 Harvey Mudd College (CA)
 Heidelberg University (OH)
 Hendrix College (AR)
 High Point University (NC)
 Hobart and William Smith Colleges (NY)
 Holy Family University (PA)
 Holy Names University (CA)
 Houghton College (NY)
 Houston Baptist University (TX)
 Huntingdon College (AL)
 Husson University (ME)
 Illinois College (IL)
 Immaculata University (PA)
 Indiana Tech (IN)
 Indiana Wesleyan University (IN)
 Iowa Wesleyan College (IA)
 Jacksonville University (FL)
 Jamestown College (ND)
 John Brown University (AR)
 Kalamazoo College (MI)
 Keuka College (NY)
 Keystone College (PA)
 Kuyper College (MI)
 La Roche College (PA)
 Lafayette College (PA)
 Lake Erie College (OH)
 Le Moyne College (NY)
 Lebanon Valley College (PA)
 Lehigh University (PA)
 Lenoir-Rhyne University (NC)
 Lesley University (MA)
 LeTourneau University (TX)
 Liberty University (VA)
 Lincoln Christian University (IL)
 Lincoln Memorial University (TN)
 Linfield College (OR)
 Loras College (IA)
 Loyola Marymount University (CA)
 Loyola University Maryland (MD)
 Marist College (NY)

Marymount University (VA)
 Maryville University of Saint Louis (MO)
 Marywood University (PA)
 McPherson College (KS)
 Methodist University (NC)
 Millikin University (IL)
 Milwaukee Institute of Art & Design (WI)
 Misericordia University (PA)
 Mississippi College (MS)
 Missouri Baptist University (MO)
 Montreat College (NC)
 Mount Mary College (WI)
 Mount Mercy College (IA)
 Mount St. Mary's University (MD)
 Mount Vernon Nazarene University (OH)
 Muhlenberg College (PA)
 Multnomah University (OR)
 Neumann University (PA)
 New England College (NH)
 Newbury College (MA)
 Newman University (KS)
 Niagara University (NY)
 North Park University (IL)
 Northwest University (WA)
 Northwestern College (MN)
 Northwood University (TX)
 Notre Dame de Namur University (CA)
 Nova Southeastern University (FL)
 Oglethorpe University (GA)
 Oklahoma City University (OK)
 Oral Roberts University (OK)
 Oregon College of Art and Craft (OR)
 Pace University (NY)
 Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts (PA)
 Philadelphia Biblical University (PA)
 Post University (CT)
 Pratt Institute (NY)
 Principia College (IL)
 Providence College (RI)
 Randolph-Macon College (VA)
 Regis College (MA)
 Regis University (CO)
 Reinhardt College (GA)
 Ripon College (WI)
 Robert Morris University (PA)
 Rockhurst University (MO)
 Roosevelt University (IL)
 Rose-Hulman Institute of Technology (IN)
 Saint Anselm College (NH)
 Saint Joseph's College (IN)
 Saint Joseph's University (PA)
 Saint Martin's University (WA)
 Saint Mary-of-the-Woods College (IN)
 Saint Mary's College of California (CA)
 Saint Norbert College (WI)
 Salve Regina University (RI)
 San Diego Christian College (CA)
 Santa Clara University (CA)
 Seattle University (WA)
 Shimer College (IL)

Simmons College (MA)
 Simpson University (CA)
 Southern Methodist University (TX)
 Southwestern College (KS)
 Spring Arbor University (MI)
 St. Augustine's College (NC)
 St. Bonaventure University (NY)
 St. Catherine University (MN)
 St. Edward's University (TX)
 St. Mary's University (TX)
 St. Thomas Aquinas College (NY)
 Stevenson University (MD)
 Stonehill College (MA)
 Susquehanna University (PA)
 Sweet Briar College (VA)
 Tabor College (KS)
 Texas Christian University (TX)
 Thiel College (PA)
 Thomas College (ME)
 Tiffin University (OH)
 Transylvania University (KY)
 Trinity Christian College (IL)
 Trinity Western University (BC)
 Tulane University (LA)
 Union College (NY)
 Union University (TN)
 University of Dallas (TX)
 University of Dayton (OH)
 University of Denver (CO)
 University of Hartford (CT)
 University of La Verne (CA)
 University of Mary Hardin-Baylor (TX)
 University of Portland (OR)
 University of Rochester (NY)
 University of Scranton, The (PA)
 University of St. Francis (IL)
 University of Tampa (FL)
 University of the Arts, The (PA)
 University of the Southwest (NM)
 University of Tulsa (OK)
 Valparaiso University (IN)
 Wagner College (NY)
 Walsh University (OH)
 Wartburg College (IA)
 Waynesburg University (PA)
 Western New England College (MA)
 Westminster College (MO)
 Westminster College (UT)
 Westmont College (CA)
 Wheeling Jesuit University (WV)
 Wheelock College (MA)
 Whitworth University (WA)
 Widener University (PA)
 Wilkes University (PA)
 Willamette University (OR)
 William Jewell College (MO)
 Wilson College (PA)
 Wittenberg University (OH)
 York College of Pennsylvania (PA)
 Zion Bible College (MA)

Definitions of regions

The analyses by region in this report were based on the following groupings of respondents by states and provinces.

East

Connecticut
 Washington, D.C.
 Massachusetts
 Maryland
 Maine
 New Hampshire
 New Jersey
 New York
 Pennsylvania
 Rhode Island
 Vermont
 West Virginia

Midwest

Iowa
 Illinois
 Indiana
 Michigan
 Minnesota
 Ohio
 Wisconsin

South

Alabama
 Arkansas
 Florida
 Georgia
 Kentucky
 Louisiana
 Missouri
 Mississippi
 North Carolina
 South Carolina
 Tennessee
 Virginia

West

Arizona
 British Columbia
 California
 Colorado
 Hawaii
 Idaho
 Kansas
 North Dakota
 Nebraska
 New Mexico
 Nevada
 Oklahoma
 Oregon
 South Dakota
 Texas
 Utah
 Washington
 Wyoming



Contact us at:
2350 Oakdale Boulevard
Coralville, Iowa 52241-9702

Phone:
800-876-1117
319-626-8380

E-mail:
ContactUs@noellevitz.com

Web:
www.noellevitz.com

All material in this paper is copyright © by Noel-Levitz, Inc. Permission is required to redistribute information from Noel-Levitz, Inc., either in print or electronically. Please contact us at ContactUs@noellevitz.com about reusing material from this paper.

Questions about this report?

We hope you have found this report to be helpful and informative. If you have questions or would like more information about the findings, please contact Jim Mager, Noel-Levitz senior associate consultant, at 1-800-876-1117 or jim-mager@noellevitz.com.



Higher Ed Benchmarks

Related reports from Noel-Levitz

Benchmark Poll Report Series

Visit: www.noellevitz.com/Benchmarks

E-Expectations Report Series

Visit: www.noellevitz.com/E-ExpectationsSeries

2010 Discounting Report

Visit: www.noellevitz.com/DiscountReport

National Student Satisfaction-Priorities Reports

Visit: www.noellevitz.com/SatisfactionBenchmarks

National Freshman Attitudes Reports

Visit: www.noellevitz.com/FreshmanAttitudes

About Noel-Levitz and our higher education research

A trusted partner to higher education, Noel-Levitz is committed to helping institutions meet their goals for enrollment and student success. Our consultants work side by side with campus executive teams to facilitate planning and to help implement the resulting plans.

For more than 20 years, we have conducted national surveys to assist campuses with benchmarking their performance. This includes benchmarking marketing/recruitment and student success outcomes and practices, monitoring student and campus usage of the Web and electronic communications, and comparing institutional budgets and policies for enrollment management. There is no charge or obligation for participating and responses to all survey items are strictly confidential. Participants have the advantage of receiving the findings first, as soon as they become available.

For more information about our consulting firm, visit www.noellevitz.com.



Find it online.

This report is posted online at: www.noellevitz.com/Benchmarks

Sign up to receive additional reports and updates. Visit our Web page:
www.noellevitz.com/Subscribe